

1 G. Smith, M.A, J.D.  
 2 55 Willow Way  
 3 Sedona, AZ 86336

4 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
 5 **FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON**  
 6 **MEDFORD DIVISION**

6	G. SMITH,	)	CASE NO.: 117CV00712CL
7		)	
8	Plaintiff,	)	
9	v.	)	REPLY IN OPPOSITION TO
10	JILL LIMERICK, BARBARA WILT	)	DEFENDANT SANSONE'S NOTICE
11	JAMES SANSONE	)	DATED APRIL 29, 2019;
12	Defendants.	)	DECLARATION IN SUPPORT;
13		)	EXHIBIT "A" and "B"
14		)	
15		)	Request for Oral Argument
16		)	by Telephone Conference

17 Plaintiff hereby replies to Defendant Sansone's Notice dated April 29, 2019, in which  
 18 Defendant Sansone ["Defendant"] incorrectly alleges that Plaintiff 1) failed to reply to  
 19 Defendant's Motion to Dismiss for Lack of Personal Jurisdiction; and 2) that such alleged failure  
 20 constitutes non-opposition to said Motion.

21 Because neither of the above allegations is correct, Plaintiff hereby opposes the notice  
 22 and its purported underlying motion.

23 As attested to in the attached declaration, on March 27, 2019, Plaintiff was served only  
 24 with an affidavit in support of a motion –without any motion-- in addition to Defendant's request  
 25 for judicial notice. See Exhibit A. Plaintiff responded to such with a Rule 12(F) Motion to Strike  
 26 Exhibits Attached to Defendant Sansone's Affidavit of 3.27.19 and Request for FRE Rule 201(E)  
 27 Hearing on Defendant's Request for Judicial Notice to Attach Exhibits, dated April 10, 2019,  
 28 attached hereto as Exhibit B.

1 As stated in the attached motion to strike, as evidenced by legal documents bearing his  
2 signature intended for filing in Oregon in 2010 reflect, for reasons including but not limited to  
3 the fact that Defendant unambiguously reached out to other Oregon plaintiffs suing Plaintiff at  
4 said time, supplying them with drafts of legal motions, thus conducting business, albeit in  
5 flagrant ethical violation, as a counselor at law in Oregon; because as the evidence reflects  
6 Defendant proceeded subsequently to assist Defendants Wilt and Limerick in their tortious  
7 conspiracy, this Court has personal jurisdiction over Defendant.  
8

9 Plaintiff's "non-response" to a non-existent motion – a motion that did not appear in the  
10 ECF filing, whether by chicanery or oversight – does not conflate to non-opposition, particularly  
11 in light of Plaintiff's aforementioned Motion to Strike, attached hereto as Exhibit B.  
12

13 DATED: May 13, 2019  
14  
15

16 \_\_\_\_\_/s/\_\_\_\_\_  
17 G. Smith, M.A., J.D.  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

DECLARATION OF G. SMITH

1. I, G. Smith, declare the following in support of the foregoing Reply in Opposition to Defendant Sansone's Notice dated April 29, 2019.

2. On March 27, 2019, I was electronically served three documents (see Exhibit A).

3. Docket #53, entitled "Motion to Dismiss/Lack of Jurisdiction" contained only two documents however: an Affidavit of James Sansone, and a Request for Judicial Notice, labeled documents number 53-1 and 53-2 respectively.

4. As there was no motion contained in the above documents, I did not formally respond to a motion, instead addressing in opposition all arguments made in Defendant Sansone's Affidavit in a Motion to Strike, docket #66, attached hereto as Exhibit B.

I declare under penalty of perjury of the laws of the United States that the foregoing is true and correct, and that this declaration was executed on May 13, 2019 in Portland, Oregon.

/s/ \_\_\_\_\_  
G. Smith, M.A., J.D.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on the above-stated date I caused to be served an electronic copy of the above-stated memorandum in opposition to Douglas McGeary and John Girarde.

\_\_\_\_\_/s/\_\_\_\_\_  
G. Smith, M.A., J.D.